IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO. 37 OF 2006

Shri Suresh Gurudas Naik
and others. ... Petitioners

versus

Union of India through
its Secretary(Labour)
and another. ... Respondents

Mr. J. F. Melo, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. V. B. Nadkarni, Senior Advocate with Mr. Y. V. Nadkarni, Advocate for the Respondents No.2.

CORAM : R. M. S. KHANDEPARKAR &
N. A. BRITTO, JJ.

DATE : 27TH FEBRUARY, 2006.

P.C.:-

Heard.

The grievance of the petitioners is that though their names were on the waiting list for a number of years they are not being considered for the vacancies which arise from time to time. Undisputedly, the law is well settled under a catena of decisions including the case of **Surindra Singh and others** v. **State of Punjab and another** reported in

(1997) 8 SCC 488 that merely because the waiting list has been prepared, once the vacancies already advertised are filled in, even though some more names remain in the waiting list, the said waiting list cannot be used as a perennial source for recruitment in relation to the vacancies arising subsequent to the filling up of the vacancies in respect of which the waiting list was prepared at the time of selection of candidates for such vacancies. Being so, the law being well settled, there is no question of interference in the matter. Hence, petition is dismissed.

R. M. S. KHANDEPARKAR, J.

N. A. BRITTO, J.

RD